

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION
CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT SURVEY**

INTRODUCTION

The Federal Railroad Administration is currently conducting a competitive procurement restricted to eligible firms certified under the SBA 8(a) Program under RFP NO. DTFR53-00-R-00015 titled, "Internet Site Development and Maintenance, Computer Programming, and Data Processing for Railroad Safety."

The prospective offeror has been requested to identify Government agencies or commercial business firms it has previously contracted with or to whom it is currently under contract, to serve as potential references on its past performance record. This survey was either sent by the prospective offeror, as instructed, or directly from FRA.

Please complete the survey and return it directly to the FRA by regular mail to: FRA, Office of Acquisition and Grants Services, ATTN: T. Riddle, Mail Stop 50, Washington, DC 20590; or by express delivery to: FRA, Office of Acquisition and Grants Services, ATTN: T. Riddle, Rm 6138, MS 50, Washington, DC 20005

If you have any questions, please contact T. Riddle, Tel: 202/493-6149; E-mail: tom.riddle@fra.dot.gov

Do not return or furnish a duplicate this survey to the offeror/contractor.

You may also be contacted by an FRA procurement official to arrange a telephone interview, using the survey as the focal point of the interview. Any relevant contractor performance/customer evaluations previously prepared within the last three years by the agency/firm providing this reference, and subsequent responses or rebuttals from the offeror/contractor, may be requested to augment or furnished in lieu of this survey or interview.

A past performance rating is not a precise mechanical process and will usually include some subjective judgement. While an offeror's past performance in meeting contract technical performance, schedule and cost control can be measured more or less precisely against the contract requirements, business relations and end user satisfaction with the offeror's performance will be somewhat subjective. To ensure frank and open evaluations and expressions of opinions by evaluators or others, all parties are advised that the identity of respondents completing the survey will be held in confidence and will not be released or disclosed to the contractor or outside the Government. However, as specified under Federal Acquisition Regulation 15.306, conditions may exist in which the contractor may be provided an opportunity to discuss adverse past performance information on which the offeror has not had a previous opportunity to comment.

In addition to the nondisclosure on the identify of the respondent/evaluator, other qualifying information provided under this performance assessment may be withheld from disclosure to the contractor when the Government determines that the inclusion of that [undisclosed] material would (1) not provide the contractor with pertinent information for the purposes of forming a rejoinder or rebuttal to the assessment, and the omission of such would not prejudice the contractor's ability to respond in full; (2) possibly expose individuals to personal law suit or litigation; (3) be contrary to an exemption from mandatory public disclosure as allowed under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552, as amended); and/or (4) not otherwise be in the best interest of the Government.

Upon request, past performance information may be made available to other Federal procurement activities. However, past performance information about a contractor shall not be provided, without the contractor's consent, to any private party, except where the agency determines that such information must be released pursuant to a Freedom of Information Act request.

Thank you in advance for taking the time and effort to complete this survey or consent to an interview.

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION

The disclosure of which is restricted. See FAR 3.104

EVALUATION RATING GUIDELINES

For the purposes of this survey, the descriptions in the following adjectival ratings should be used as guidelines for rating the offeror/contractor in each of the areas of evaluation, or in other dimensions of the contract that are included in the survey.

Excellent - There were (are) essentially no problems, weaknesses, or deficiencies of consequence, nor negative performances issues as it applies to the respective area of evaluation (i.e., quality of service, timeliness of performance, cost control, key personnel, business/management practices, or customer satisfaction) or other dimensions of the contract. In addition, performance in the respective area of evaluation, consistently and reliably far exceeded expectations or standards as set forth in the contract or as prior experience and knowledge of the industry would suggest or dictate. As applicable, the approach, methodology, level and/or type of staff, consultant expertise, work experience, dedicated resources and service, and/or supportable estimates, was (is) exceptional. A rating at this level would typically be characterized as “extremely satisfied.” Ratings of “Excellent” should be documented with specific information supporting the rationale or basis for this highest of ratings.

Very Good - There were (are) essentially no problems, weaknesses, or deficiencies of consequence, nor negative performances issues as it applies to the respective area of evaluation (i.e., quality of service, timeliness of performance, cost control, key personnel, business/management practices, or customer satisfaction) or other dimensions of the contract. In addition, performance in the respective area of evaluation, consistently and reliably exceeded expectations or standards as set forth in the contract or as prior experience and knowledge of the industry would suggest or dictate. As applicable, the approach, methodology, level and/or type of staff, consultant expertise, work experience, dedicated resources and service, and/or supportable estimates, was (is) well-above average. Ratings of “Excellent” should be documented with specific information documenting or supporting the rationale. A rating at this level would typically be characterized as “highly satisfied.” Ratings of “Very Good” should be documented with specific information supporting the rationale or basis for this higher ratings.

Good (Standard) - There were (are) relatively few, if any, (correctable) problems, weaknesses, or deficiencies of minor consequence, or negative performances issues as it applies to the respective area of evaluation (i.e., quality of service, timeliness of performance, cost control, key personnel, business/management practices, or customer satisfaction) or other dimensions of the contract. In addition, performance in the respective area of evaluation, fully met expectations or standards as set forth in the contract or as prior experience and knowledge of the industry would suggest or dictate. As applicable, the approach, methodology, level and/or type of staff, consultant expertise, work experience, dedicated resources and service, and/or supportable estimates, was (is) average. A rating at this level would typically be characterized as “sufficiently satisfied.”

Fair - There were (are) some (correctable) problems, weaknesses, or deficiencies of minor consequence, or negative performances issues as it applies to the respective area of evaluation (i.e., quality of service, timeliness of performance, cost control, key personnel, business/management practices, or customer satisfaction) or other dimensions of the contract. In addition, performance in the respective area of evaluation, only marginally met expectations or standards as set forth in the contract or as prior experience and knowledge of the industry would suggest or dictate. As applicable, the approach, methodology, level and/or type of staff, consultant expertise, work experience, dedicated resources and service, and/or supportable estimates, was (is) below-average. Ratings of “Fair” should be documented with specific information supporting the rationale or basis for this lower rating.

Poor - There were (are) numerous (correctable) problems, weaknesses, or deficiencies of consequence, or negative performances issues as it applies to the respective area of evaluation (i.e., quality of service, timeliness of performance, cost control, key personnel, business/management practices, or customer satisfaction) or other dimensions of the contract. In addition, performance in the respective area of evaluation, only slightly met or virtually failed to meet some expectations or standards as set forth in the contract or as prior experience and knowledge of the industry would suggest or dictate. As applicable, the approach, methodology, level and/or type of staff, consultant expertise, work experience, dedicated resources and service, and/or supportable estimates, was (is) far below-average. Ratings of “Poor” should be documented with specific information supporting the rationale or basis for this lowest rating before performance is considered totally unsatisfactory.

Unsatisfactory - There were (are) numerous (uncorrectable) problems, weaknesses, or deficiencies of major consequence, or negative performances issues as it applies to the respective area of evaluation (i.e., quality of service, timeliness of performance, cost control, key personnel, business/management practices, or customer satisfaction) or other dimensions of the contract. In addition, performance in the respective area of evaluation, failed to meet expectations or standards as set forth in the contract or as prior experience and knowledge of the industry would suggest or dictate. As applicable, the approach, methodology, level and/or type of staff, consultant expertise, work experience, dedicated resources and service, and/or supportable estimates, was (is) unacceptable. Ratings of “Unsatisfactory” should be documented with specific information supporting the rationale or basis for this lowest of ratings.

PART I - ADMINISTRATION

3

(To be completed by Offeror/Contractor or Agency/Business Reference or Interviewer/Procurement Official)

Name of Agency/Business Reference Conducting Assessment:	
Contractor Name:	
Contract No.	Delivery/Task Order No.
Short-Title/Description of Supplies/Services:	
Performance Period(s): Base Period- from to & Base plus All Options - from to	
Dollar Value(s): Base Period - & Base plus All Options -	
Contract Type and Method of Contracting: <i>(Check all that apply)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Full & Open Competition <input type="checkbox"/> Other Than Full & Open Competition <input type="checkbox"/> Negotiated <input type="checkbox"/> Sealed Bid <input type="checkbox"/> Simplified Acquisition <input type="checkbox"/> FSS/MAS <input type="checkbox"/> 2-Step or Phased <input type="checkbox"/> Firm Fixed Price <input type="checkbox"/> Other FP type _____ <i>(specify)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Cost (no fee) <input type="checkbox"/> Cost Plus Fixed Fee <input type="checkbox"/> Other Cost Reimbursement type _____ <i>(specify)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> Other Contract type _____ <i>(specify)</i> <input type="checkbox"/> SBA 8(a) <input type="checkbox"/> SBIR <input type="checkbox"/> HUBZone Set-Aside <input type="checkbox"/> SDB Price Adjustment <input type="checkbox"/> Small Business Set-Aside	

PART II - RELEVANCY/PERSPECTIVE*(To be completed by Reference Evaluator/Respondent or Interviewing Contracting/Procurement Official)*

With respect to the referenced contract evaluated herein <i>(Check or fill-in, as appropriate)</i> . . .	
a.	Did the contractor seeking a reference serve as the prime contractor or a major subcontractor? <input type="checkbox"/> prime <input type="checkbox"/> major subcontractor.
b.	What percentage of the contract would you estimate the contractor (as the prime or subcontractor) was responsible for performing? _____% If less than 60%, who was the prime or major subcontractor, as applicable? _____
c.	Identify the key or essential contractor or subcontractor persons <i>(Note: The same person can be identified as having served in one or more functional areas of responsibilities)</i> who served as . . .
	(1) Project Manager (or equivalent) with responsibility for overall performance and ultimate success of the project <u>Name:</u> _____ <u>Area of Expertise:</u> _____ <u>[] Prime or [] Sub</u>
	(2) Functional Manager (or equivalent) with primary responsibility for functional and technical issues/operations <u>Name:</u> _____ <u>Area of Expertise:</u> _____ <u>[] Prime or [] Sub</u>
	(3) Team or Technical Section Leader (or equivalent) with responsibility for specific, critical technical area/group <u>Name:</u> _____ <u>Area of Expertise:</u> _____ <u>[] Prime or [] Sub</u>
	(4) Administrator (or equivalent) with responsibility for the administrative and business functions <u>Name:</u> _____ <u>Area of Expertise:</u> _____ <u>[] Prime or [] Sub</u>
d.	Did the contract require performance in any of the following Information Technology (IT) disciplines/specialties--
	(1) Multiple database production? <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no. If yes, would you characterize the level of work as <input type="checkbox"/> routine/ rudimentary <input type="checkbox"/> moderately complicated <input type="checkbox"/> highly complex. If yes, would you say this work constituted <input type="checkbox"/> a small part <input type="checkbox"/> a significant part <input type="checkbox"/> a large part of the total requirement.
	(2) Client-based software development? <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no. If yes, would you characterize the level of work as <input type="checkbox"/> routine/ rudimentary <input type="checkbox"/> moderately complicated <input type="checkbox"/> highly complex. If yes, would you say this work constituted <input type="checkbox"/> a small part <input type="checkbox"/> a significant part <input type="checkbox"/> a large part of the total requirement.
	(3) Web-site development? <input type="checkbox"/> yes <input type="checkbox"/> no. If yes, would you characterize the level of work as <input type="checkbox"/> routine/ rudimentary <input type="checkbox"/> moderately complicated <input type="checkbox"/> highly complex. If yes, would you say this work constituted <input type="checkbox"/> a small part <input type="checkbox"/> a significant part <input type="checkbox"/> a large part of the total requirement.

PART III - EVALUATOR/RESPONDENT'S ASSESSMENT

(To be completed by Reference Evaluator/Respondent or Interviewing Contracting/Procurement Official)

1. Quality of Product or Service

Were deliverables in compliance with contract requirements or specifications?					<input type="checkbox"/> yes - <input type="checkbox"/> no - <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input type="checkbox"/> n/a to assessment period	
Were applications/programs/software developed by the contractor generally reliable, free of significant errors/omissions, well-documented, professional and otherwise acceptable?					<input type="checkbox"/> yes - <input type="checkbox"/> no - <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input type="checkbox"/> n/a to assessment period	
Were the services/tasks performed and/or deliverables furnished in conformance with standards of good workmanship and otherwise acceptable?					<input type="checkbox"/> yes - <input type="checkbox"/> no - <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input type="checkbox"/> n/a to assessment period	
QUALITY OF PRODUCT/SERVICE	Unacceptable	Poor	Fair	Good (Standard)	Very Good	Excellent
Adjectival Rating (Check one)						
<i>Use remaining space (and additional cross-referenced sheets, as necessary) to--</i> <i>(1) Describe rationale/basis for any "no" responses, and (2) Explain rationale/basis for adjectival rating of other than "Good"</i>						

2. Timeliness of Performance

Were all deliverable(s) and/or report(s) furnished on or before the time/event specified in or agreed to pursuant to the contract?					<input type="checkbox"/> yes - <input type="checkbox"/> no - <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input type="checkbox"/> n/a to assessment period	
Were contract schedules consistently met and adhered to, and were timely adjustments made in response to technical direction so as to stay on agreed schedule(s)?					<input type="checkbox"/> yes - <input type="checkbox"/> no - <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input type="checkbox"/> n/a to assessment period	
Did the contractor alert the Government to potential problems and successfully solve problems in a timely fashion?					<input type="checkbox"/> yes - <input type="checkbox"/> no - <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input type="checkbox"/> n/a to assessment period	
TIMELINESS OF PERFORMANCE	Unacceptable	Poor	Fair	Good (Standard)	Very Good	Excellent
Adjectival Rating (Check one)						
<i>Use remaining space (and additional cross-referenced sheets, as necessary) to--</i> <i>(1) Describe rationale/basis for any "no" responses, and (2) Explain rationale/basis for adjectival rating of other than "Good"</i>						

3. Cost Control

Did the contractor operate at or below budget?						<input type="checkbox"/> yes - <input type="checkbox"/> no - <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input type="checkbox"/> n/a to assessment period	
Were actual cost expenditures reported by the contractor generally in line with projected costs (including approved shifts in effort/resources) for designated time frames or specific supplies/services?						<input type="checkbox"/> yes - <input type="checkbox"/> no - <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input type="checkbox"/> n/a to assessment period	
Was the contractor diligent in using the appropriate level and mix of labor while simultaneously providing an economical and cost efficient labor force including the use of junior- or journeyman-level personnel where and when appropriate?						<input type="checkbox"/> yes - <input type="checkbox"/> no - <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input type="checkbox"/> n/a to assessment period	
COST CONTROL	Unacceptable	Poor	Fair	Good (Standard)	Very Good	Excellent	
Adjectival Rating (Check one)							
Use remaining space (and additional cross-referenced sheets, as necessary) to-- (1) Describe rationale/basis for any "no" responses, and (2) Explain rationale/basis for adjectival rating of other than "Good"							

4. Key Personnel

Did key personnel perform at the level of expertise proposed in the contract, and did they perform pivotal portions of the contract, to include project management oversight, functional/technical direction, and resource or budget allocation(s)?						<input type="checkbox"/> yes - <input type="checkbox"/> no - <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input type="checkbox"/> n/a to assessment period	
Did contractor key personnel and/or primary technical representative(s) instill confidence in the firm's technical capability, product, services and/or ability to get the job done on time and within budget?						<input type="checkbox"/> yes - <input type="checkbox"/> no - <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input type="checkbox"/> n/a to assessment period	
Were key personnel identified under the contract readily accessible to you when you needed them, and in crisis, did they instantly understand and access the situation and recommend viable solutions/options?						<input type="checkbox"/> yes - <input type="checkbox"/> no - <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input type="checkbox"/> n/a to assessment period	
KEY PERSONNEL	Unacceptable	Poor	Fair	Good (Standard)	Very Good	Excellent	
Adjectival Rating (Check one)							
Use remaining space (and additional cross-referenced sheets, as necessary) to-- (1) Describe rationale/basis for any "no" responses, and (2) Explain rationale/basis for adjectival rating of other than "Good"							

5. Business/Management Practices

Was the contractor responsive to Government complaints and did the contractor commit adequate resources to meet contract requirements or otherwise provide effective solutions to solve problems as they arose?						<input type="checkbox"/> yes - <input type="checkbox"/> no - <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input type="checkbox"/> n/a to assessment period	
When a problem was discovered, was the contractor receptive to finding the problem and fixing it, and did the contractor NOT use excuses to delay the fixing or cite the need for additional funds for each fix?						<input type="checkbox"/> yes - <input type="checkbox"/> no - <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input type="checkbox"/> n/a to assessment period	
Did the contractor exhibit good business acumen and show business-like concern for the interest of the Government?						<input type="checkbox"/> yes - <input type="checkbox"/> no - <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input type="checkbox"/> n/a to assessment period	
BUSINESS/MGMT PRACTICES	Unacceptable	Poor	Fair	Good (Standard)	Very Good	Excellent	
Adjectival Rating (Check one)							
Use remaining space (and additional cross-referenced sheets, as necessary) to-- (1) Describe rationale/basis for any "no" responses, and (2) Explain rationale/basis for adjectival rating of other than "Good"							

6. Customer Satisfaction

Were the majority of program/technical official and/or end users consistency satisfied with the services performed or supplies/deliverables furnished?						<input type="checkbox"/> yes - <input type="checkbox"/> no - <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input type="checkbox"/> n/a to assessment period	
Do you feel that the Government/business firm is getting/has gotten its "money's worth" for the services performed and/or supplies/deliverables furnished?						<input type="checkbox"/> yes - <input type="checkbox"/> no - <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input type="checkbox"/> n/a to assessment period	
Would you recommend or elect to contract with this contractor for future work of the same or substantially similar nature as that conducted under the contract evaluated in this survey?						<input type="checkbox"/> yes - <input type="checkbox"/> no - <input type="checkbox"/> n/a <input type="checkbox"/> n/a to assessment period	
CUSTOMER SATISFACTION	Unacceptable	Poor	Fair	Good (Standard)	Very Good	Excellent	
Adjectival Rating (Check one)							
Use remaining space (and additional cross-referenced sheets, as necessary) to-- (1) Describe rationale/basis for any "no" responses, and (2) Explain rationale/basis for adjectival rating of other than "Good"							

7. Other Performance Issues

Significant Events - Identify any significant events that occurred during the assessment period not previously mentioned.
(Check all that apply and explain circumstances and actions (use additional cross-referenced sheets, as necessary))

Less Than Favorable Events

☐ Liquidated damages were assessed - ☐ experienced cost overruns - ☐ delayed excuses rejected/disapproved - ☐ cure notice(s) or show cause notice(s) were issued - ☐ partial or full Termination for Default (T4D) was initiated or completed - ☐ debarment or suspension instated - ☐ Other (*Specify*)

Presumably Neutral Events

☐ Partial or full Termination for Convenience (T4C) was initiated or completed - ☐ no cost settlement was initiated or completed - ☐ Government and contractor negotiated acceptance of nonconforming supplies for appropriate consideration - ☐ debarment or suspension lifted - ☐ Other (*Specify*)

Favorable Events

☐ Contractor received copyright(s) or patent(s) on items developed under the contract - ☐ experienced meaningful cost-savings - ☐ contractor awarded incentive within terms of contract - ☐ contractor received governmental or industry-recognized award or received a widely accepted industry certification for quality and/or quality improvement - ☐ Other (*Specify*)

Deficiencies/Weaknesses/Risks/Reservations - Use this space (and additional cross-referenced sheets, as necessary) to recount any specific shortcomings or problems in contractor performance in the evaluated area(s), or in other dimensions of the contract not already addressed or which demand additional detail, or to address any areas of concern or reservations about contracting with the contractor in the future.

Extraordinary/Superior/ Remarkable/Noteworthy Performance - Use this space (and additional cross-referenced sheets, as necessary) to recount any specific extraordinary or remarkable contractor performance in the evaluated area(s), or in other dimensions of the contract not already addressed or which demand additional detail.

PART IV - SIGNATURE/CONFIRMATION

(To be completed and signed by Evaluator/Respondent)

Name of Evaluator/Respondent/Interviewee (when applicable)

Official's Position or Title

(e.g., COTR, Task Monitor, Project Manager, etc.):

Address of Activity/Business Reference:

Telephone No.

Fax No.

Internet Address:

Signature:

Date:

(To be completed by Interviewer only when survey is completed on behalf of Evaluator/Respondent. Otherwise leave blank.)

Name of Interviewer:

Telephone No.

Fax No.

Internet Address:

Signature:

Date of Interview:

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION

The disclosure of which is restricted. See FAR 3.104